arXiv:1703.04963v1 [math.CO] 15 Mar 2017

On Combinatorial Properties of Points and Polynomial Curves

Hiroyuki Miyata
Department of Computer Science,
Gunma University, Japan
hmiyata@cs.gunma-u.ac.jp

March 16, 2017

Abstract

Oriented matroids are a combinatorial model, which can be viewed as a combinatorial abstraction of partitions of point sets in the Euclidean space by families of hyperplanes. They capture essential combinatorial properties of point configurations, hyperplane arrangements, and polytopes, and oriented matroid theory has been developed in the context of various research fields.

In this paper, we introduce a new class of oriented matroids, called degree-k oriented matroids, which captures the essential combinatorial properties of partitions of point sets in the 2-dimensional Euclidean space by graphs of polynomial functions of degree k. We prove that the notion of degree-k oriented matroids completely characterizes combinatorial structures arising from a natural geometric generalization of configurations formed by points and graphs of polynomial functions degree k. This may be viewed as an analogue of the Folkman-Lawrence topological representation theorem for oriented matroids.

1 Introduction

Oriented matroids are a combinatorial model, introduced independently by Bland, Folkman, Las Vergnas, and Lawrence (published in [3] and [7]). Oriented matroids abstract various objects such as point configurations, vector configurations, polytopes, hyperplane arrangements, and digraphs, and provide a unified framework for discussing various combinatorial aspects of these objects. They have a rich structure, which can describe, for example, face structures of polytopes and hyperplane arrangements, partitions of point sets by hyperplanes, linear programming duality, and Gale duality in polytope theory. Nowadays, oriented matroid theory is a fairly rich subject of research, with connections to various research fields such as discrete and computational geometry, graph theory, operations research, topology, and algebraic geometry (see [2]). One of the outstanding results in oriented matroid theory is the topological representation theorem, introduced by Folkman and Lawrence [7] (see [2, 4, 5] for simplified proofs), which says that there is a one-to-one correspondence between oriented matroids and equivalence classes of *pseudosphere arrangements*. This theorem bridges topology and combinatorics, and shows that oriented matroids constitute a natural combinatorial model.

Motivated by oriented matroid theory, it is natural to consider whether a useful theory can be developed by abstracting combinatorial aspects of other related objects. Because one of the common ways of understanding oriented matroids is the combinatorial abstraction of partitions of point sets in the Euclidean space by families of hyperplanes, we consider combinatorial abstraction of partitions of point sets by other geometric objects.

Recently, Eliáš and Matoušek [6] proposed a new interesting generalization of the Erdős-Szekeres theorem. To prove the theorem, they investigated the combinatorial properties of partitions of point sets by graphs of certain families of polynomial functions of degree k. In this paper, we discuss more closely what kind of combinatorial properties are exhibited by such partitions. In fact, we show that the combinatorial properties observed by Eliáš and Matoušek represent in some sense almost *all* of the combinatorial

properties that can be proved using some natural geometric properties. To do so, we first observe a slightly stronger combinatorial property of partitions than those observed by Eliáš and Matoušek, and then we introduce a combinatorial model called *degree-k oriented matroids* by axiomatizing the observed combinatorial properties. We prove that degree-k oriented matroids completely characterize partitions arising from *k-intersecting pseudoconfigurations of points*, which are a natural geometric generalization of configurations of points and graphs of polynomial functions of degree k. This provides an analogue of the topological representation theorem for oriented matroids, and shows that degree-k oriented matroids capture the essential combinatorial properties of partitions of point sets by graphs of polynomial functions of degree k.

Related work

The partitions of a point set in the Euclidean space by a certain family of spheres determine an oriented matroid, which is called a *Delaunay oriented matroid* (see [2, Section 1.9]). Santos [13] proved that partitions of a point set in the 2-dimensional Euclidean space by spheres defined by a smooth, strictly convex distance function also fulfill the oriented matroid axioms. Miyata [12] proved that the class of partitions of point sets in the 2-dimensional Euclidean space by pseudocircles coincides with the rank 4 matroid polytopes. Ardila and Develin [1] introduced tropical oriented matroids as a combinatorial abstraction of tropical hyperplane arrangements. Horn [9] proved that every tropical oriented matroid can be represented as a tropical pseudohyperplane arrangement.

Notation

Here, we summarize the notation that will be employed in this paper. In the following, we assume that S is a finite ordered set, X is a sign vector on E, P is a point in the 2-dimensional Euclidean space, and r is a positive integer.

- $\Lambda(S,r) := \{(\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_r) \in S^r \mid \lambda_1 < \cdots < \lambda_r\}$.
- $\bar{\lambda} := \{\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_r\}$ for $\lambda = (\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_r) \in \Lambda(S,r)$.
- $\lambda \setminus \{\lambda_k\} := (\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_{k-1},\lambda_{k+1},\dots,\lambda_r)$ for $\lambda = (\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_r) \in \Lambda(S,r)$.
- $\lambda[\lambda_i|k] := (\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_{i-1},k,\lambda_{i+1}\dots,\lambda_r)$ for $\lambda = (\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_r) \in \Lambda(S,r)$.
- $\bar{X} := \{e \in E \mid X(e) \neq 0\}$.
- X^+ (resp. X^-, X^0) $:= \{e \in E \mid X(e) = +1 \text{ (resp. } -1, 0)\}$.
- $x(P)$: the x-coordinate of P.
- $y(P)$: the y-coordinate of P.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we summarize some basic facts regarding oriented matroids. See [2] for further details.

Let $P = (p_e)_{e\in[n]}$ be a point configuration in general position (i.e., no $d+1$ points of P lie on the same hyperplane) in $\mathbb{R}^d$, and let $V := (v_e)_{e\in[n]}$ be the vector configuration in $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ with $v_e := (p_e^T, 1)^T$. To see how P is separated by hyperplanes, let us consider the map $\chi_P : [n]^{d+1} \to \{+1,-1,0\}$ defined by

$$\chi_P(i_1,\dots,i_{d+1}) := \operatorname{sign}\det(v_{i_1},\dots,v_{i_{d+1}}) \text{ for } i_1,\dots,i_{d+1} \in [n],$$

where $\operatorname{sign}(a) = +1$ (resp. $-1, 0$) if $a > 0$ (resp. $a < 0, a = 0$). Then, we have

$$\chi_P(i_1,\dots,i_d,j)\chi_P(i_1,\dots,i_d,k) = +1$$
$$\Leftrightarrow \text{ The points } p_j \text{ and } p_k \text{ lie on the same side of the hyperplane spanned by } p_{i_1},\dots,p_{i_d}.$$

The map χ_P contains rich combinatorial information regarding P, such as convexity, the face lattice of the convex hull, and possible combinatorial types of triangulations (see [2]). The chirotope axioms of oriented matroids are obtained by abstracting the properties of χ_P.

Definition 2.1 (Chirotope axioms for oriented matroids)
For $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and a finite set E, a map $\chi : E^r \to \{+1, -1, 0\}$ is called a *chirotope* if it satisfies the following axioms. The pair $(E, \{\chi, -\chi\})$ is called an *oriented matroid of rank* r.

(B1) χ is not identically zero.

(B2) $\chi(i_{\sigma(1)}, \ldots, i_{\sigma(r)}) = \mathrm{sgn}(\sigma)\chi(i_1, \ldots, i_r)$, for any $i_1, \ldots, i_r \in E$ and any permutation σ on E.

(B3) For any $\lambda, \mu \in E^r$, we have

$$\{\chi(\lambda)\chi(\mu)\} \cup \{\chi(\lambda[\lambda_1|\mu_s])\chi(\mu[\mu_s|\lambda_1]) \mid s = 1, \ldots, r\} \supset \{+1, -1\} \text{ or } = \{0\}.$$

We remark that (B3) is combinatorial abstraction of the Grassmann-Plücker relations:

$$\det(V_\lambda)\det(V_\mu) = \sum_{s=1}^{r} \det(V_{\lambda[\lambda_1|\mu_s]})\det(V_{\mu[\mu_s|\lambda_1]}),$$

where $V_\tau := (v_{\tau_1}, \ldots, v_{\tau_r})$ for $\tau \in \Lambda([n], d+1)$.

The set $C_P^* := \{\pm(\chi_P(\lambda, e))_{e\in[n]} \mid \lambda \in [n]^d\}$ also contains equivalent information to χ_P. The cocircuit axioms of oriented matroids are introduced by abstracting the properties of the set $\mathcal{C}_P^*$.

Definition 2.2 (Cocircuit axioms for oriented matroids)
A collection $\mathcal{C}^* \subset \{+1, -1, 0\}^E$ satisfying Axioms (C0)–(C3) is called the set of *cocircuits* of an oriented matroid.

(C0) $0 \notin \mathcal{C}^*$.

(C1) $\mathcal{C}^* = -\mathcal{C}^*$.

(C2) For all $X, Y \in \mathcal{C}^*$, if $\bar{X} \subset \bar{Y}$, then $X = Y$ or $X = -Y$.

(C3) For any $X, Y \in \mathcal{C}^*$ and $e \in (X^+ \cap Y^-) \cup (X^- \cap Y^+)$, there exists $Z \in \mathcal{C}^*$ with

$Z^0 = (X^0 \cap Y^0) \cup \{e\}$, $Z^+ \supset X^+ \cap Y^+$, and $Z^- \supset X^- \cap Y^-$.

From a chirotope χ, we can construct the cocircuits $C^* := \{\pm(\chi(\lambda, e))_{e\in E} \mid \lambda \in \Lambda(E, r-1)\}$. It is also possible to reconstruct the chirotope χ (up to a sign reversal) from the cocircuits $\mathcal{C}^*$. A rank r oriented matroid $(E, \{\chi, -\chi\})$ is said to be *uniform* if $\chi(\lambda) \neq 0$ for any $\lambda \in \Lambda(E, r)$ (equivalently if $|X^0| = r$ for any cocircuit X). If the underlying strucure of the set $\mathcal{C}^* \subset \{+, -, 0\}^E$ is known to be uniform, i.e., if $|X^0| = r$ for any $X \in \mathcal{C}^*$, then Axiom (C3) can be replaced by the following axiom:

(C3') For any $X, Y \in \mathcal{C}^*$ with $|X^0 \setminus Y^0| = 1$ and $e \in (X^+ \cap Y^-) \cup (X^- \cap Y^+)$, there exists $Z \in \mathcal{C}^*$ with $Z^0 = (X^0 \cap Y^0) \cup \{e\}$, $Z^+ \supset X^+ \cap Y^+$, and $Z^- \supset X^- \cap Y^-$.

More generally, Axiom (C3) can be replaced by the axiom of *modular elimination*. For further details, see [2, Section 3.6]. An oriented matroid $(E, \mathcal{C}^*)$ is *acyclic* if for any $e \in E$ there exists $X_e \in \mathcal{C}^*$ with $e \in X_e^+$ and $X_e^- = \emptyset$. It can easily be seen that oriented matroids arising from point configurations are acyclic.

One of the outstanding facts in oriented matriod theory is that oriented matroids always admit topological representations, as established by Folkman and Lawrence [7]. Here, we explain a variant of this fact, which was originally formulated in terms of *allowable sequences* by Goodman and Pollack [8]. First, we observe that oriented matroids also arise from generalization of point configurations, called *pseudoconfigurations of points* (also called *generalized configurations of points*).

Definition 2.3 (Pseudoconfigurations of points)
A pair $PP = (P, L)$ of a point configuration $P := (p_e)_{e\in[n]}$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$ and a collection L of unbounded Jordan curves is called a *pseudoconfiguration of points* (or a *generalized configuration of points*) if the following hold.

- For any $l \in L$, there exist at least two points of P lying on l.
- For any two points of P, there exists a unique curve in L that contains both points.
- Any pair of (distinct) curves $l_1, l_2 \in L$ intersects at most once.

For each $l \in L$, we label the two connected components of $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus l$ arbitrarily as l^+ and l^-. Then, we assign the sign vector $X_l \in \{+1, -1, 0\}^n$ such that $X_l^0 = \{e \in [n] \mid p_e \in l\}$, $X_l^+ = \{e \in [n] \mid p_e \in l^+\}$ and $X_l^- = \{e \in [n] \mid p_e \in l^-\}$, and we let $\mathcal{C}^*_{PP} := \{\pm X_l \mid l \in L\}$. Then, $\mathcal{M}_{PP} = ([n], \mathcal{C}^*_{PP})$ turns out to be an acyclic oriented matroid of rank 3. Goodman and Pollack [8] proved that in fact the converse also holds.

Theorem 2.4 (Topological representation theorem for acyclic oriented matroids of rank 3 [8])
For any acyclic oriented matroid $\mathcal{M}$ of rank 3, there exists a pseudoconfiguration of points PP with $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_{PP}$.



Figure 1: A pseudoconfiguraiton of points in $\mathbb{R}^2$

Here, the assumption that $\mathcal{M}$ is acyclic is not important, because non-acyclic oriented matroids can be represented as *signed pseudoconfigurations of points*, where each point has a sign.

The notion of pseudoconfigurations of points in the $d(\geq 3)$-dimensional Euclidean space can be introduced analogously, but not every acyclic oriented matroid of rank $d + 1$ can be represented as a pseudoconfiguration of points in the d-dimensional Euclidean space. For further details, see [2, Section 5.3]. However, oriented matroids of general rank can be represented as pseudosphere arrangements [7], with further details presented in [2, Section 5.2].

3 Definition of degree-k oriented matroids

In this section, we introduce degree-k oriented matroids as a combinatorial model, which captures the essential combinatorial properties of configurations of points and graphs of polynomial functions. To do so, we first review some results that were introduced by Eliáš and Matoušek [6].

Eliáš and Matoušek [6] introduced the notion of kth-order monotonity, which is a generalization of the usual notion of monotonity, described as follows. (Because it is more convenient in our context to reinterpret the $(k+1)$st-order monotonity of Eliáš and Matoušek as the kth-order mononity, the following definitions are slightly different from the originals.) Let $P = (p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ be a point configuration in the 2-dimensional Euclidean space with $x(p_1) < \cdots < x(p_n)$. We assume that P is in *k-general position*, i.e., no $k + 2$ points of P lie on the graph of a polynomial function of degree at most k. Furthermore, we define a $(k + 2)$-tuple of points in P to be *positive* (resp. *negative*) if they lie on the graph of a function whose $(k + 1)$st order derivative is everywhere nonnegative (resp. nonpositive). A subset $S \subset [n]$ is said

to be *kth-order monotone* if its $(k+2)$-tuples are either all positive or all negative. This notion can be stated in an alternative manner using the map $\chi_P^k : [n]^{k+2} \to \{+1, -1, 0\}$, defined as follows.

$$\chi_P^k(i_1, \ldots, i_{k+2}) := \mathrm{sign}(N_{i_1,\ldots,i_{k+1}}(p_{i_{k+2}})),$$

where $N_{i_1,\ldots,i_{k+1}}$ is the Newton interpolation polynomial of the points $p_{i_1}, \ldots, p_{i_{k+1}}$, i.e., $y = N_{i_1,\ldots,i_{k+1}}(x)$ is the unique polynomial function of degree k whose graph passes through the points $p_{i_1}, \ldots, p_{i_{k+1}}$. Under this definition, a subset S is kth-order monotone if and only if $\chi_P^k(s_1, \ldots, s_{k+2}) = +1$ for all $(s_1, \ldots, s_{k+2}) \in \Lambda(S, k+2)$ (see [6, Lemma 2.4]). This map contains information on which side of the graph of the polynomial function of degree k determined by $p_{i_1}, \ldots, p_{i_{k+1}}$ the point $p_{i_{k+2}}$ lies. In other words, the map χ_P^k contains information regarding the partitions of P by graphs of polynomial functions of degree k.

It is shown in [6] that the map χ_P^k can be computed in terms of determinants of a higher-dimensional space.

Proposition 3.1 ($(k+2)$-dimensional linear representability [6, Lemma 5.1])
Let $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^{k+2}$ be the map that sends each point $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ to $(1, x, \ldots, x^k, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{k+2}$. Then, we have

$$\chi_P^k(i_1, \ldots, i_{k+2}) = \mathrm{sign}(\det(f(p_{i_1}), \ldots, f(p_{i_{k+2}}))) \text{ for all } (i_1, \ldots, i_{k+2}) \in [n]^{k+2},$$

i.e., the map χ_P^k is a chirotope of an oriented matroid of rank $k+2$.

Proof. The proof is not difficult, and we refer the reader to [6]. The latter statement will be proved in Proposition 4.4 in a more general context. ∎

Eliáš and Matoušek [6] additionally observed the following useful property.

Proposition 3.2 (Transitivity [6, Lemma 2.5])
If $\chi_P^k(I_{k+3} \setminus \{i_{k+3}\}) = \chi_P^k(I_{k+3} \setminus \{i_1\})$ for $I_{k+3} := (i_1, \ldots, i_{k+3}) \in \Lambda([n], k+3)$, then we have $\chi_P^k(I) = \chi_P^k(I_{k+3} \setminus \{i_{k+3}\})$ for all $I \in \Lambda(I_{k+3}, k+2)$.

Proof. This proposition is proved in [6], using Newton interpolation polynomials. Here, we provide a geometric proof for $k = 2$. The generalization of this is straightforward.

Without loss of generality, we assume that $\chi_P^2(i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4) = +1$, which means that the point p_{i_4} is above the graph $y = N_{i_1,i_2,i_3}(x)$. Note that the graphs $y = N_{i_1,i_2,i_3}(x)$ and $y = N_{i_2,i_3,i_4}(x)$ intersect at p_{i_2} and p_{i_3}, and that they do not intersect elsewhere. This indicates that the graph $y = N_{i_2,i_3,i_4}(x)$ lies above the graph $y = N_{i_1,i_2,i_3}(x)$ for $x > x(p_{i_3})$. The point p_{i_5} is above the graph $y = N_{i_2,i_3,i_4}(x)$ by the assumption $\chi_P^2(i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5) = +1$, and it follows that p_{i_5} lies above the graph $y = N_{i_1,i_2,i_3}(x)$, which implies that $\chi_P^2(i_1, i_2, i_3, i_5) = +1$. The same argument can be applied when either of the graphs $y = N_{i_1,i_2,i_4}(x)$ or $y = N_{i_1,i_3,i_4}(x)$ are considered instead of $y = N_{i_1,i_2,i_3}(x)$. ∎

In [6], this property is used to prove a new generalization of the Erdős-Szekeres theorem, which states that there is always a k-monotone subset of size $\Omega(n)$ in any point set P of size $\mathrm{twr}_k(n)$ in k-general position, where $\mathrm{twr}_k(x)$ is the kth tower function. Our first observation is that χ_P^k actually admits the following stronger property.

Proposition 3.3 ($(k+3)$-locally unimodal property)
For any $\lambda \in \Lambda([n], k+3)$ and $\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3 \in \Lambda(\bar{\lambda}, k+2)$ with $\mu_1 < \mu_2 < \mu_3$ (lexicographic order, i.e., there exist $a, b, c \in \bar{\lambda}$ $(a < b < c)$ with $\mu_1 = \lambda \setminus \{c\}, \mu_2 = \lambda \setminus \{b\}, \mu_3 = \lambda \setminus \{a\}$), it holds that if $\chi_P^k(\mu_1) = -\chi_P^k(\mu_2)$, then $\chi_P^k(\mu_3) = \chi_P^k(\mu_2)$.



Figure 2: Configuration with $\chi_P^2(i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4) = +1$ and $\chi_P^2(i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5) = +1$

Proof. The case with $k = 2$ can easily be proved by careful examination of the proof of Proposition 3.2. We will prove this proposition later in a more general context (Proposition 4.4), and so we omit the full proof here. ∎

In the next section, we will prove that the above-mentioned properties are in some sense *all* combinatorial properties that can be proved using some natural geometric properties. This motivates us to consider combinatorial structures characterized by those properties.

Definition 3.4 (Degree-k oriented matroids)
Let E be a finite ordered set. We say that a rank $k+2$ uniform oriented matroid $\mathcal{M} = (E, \{\chi, -\chi\})$ is called a *degree-k uniform oriented matroid* if it satisfies the following condition. For any $\lambda \in \Lambda(E, k+3)$ and $\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3 \in \Lambda(\bar{\lambda}, k+2)$ with $\mu_1 < \mu_2 < \mu_3$ (lexicographic order), it holds that if $\chi(\mu_1) = -\chi(\mu_2)$, then $\chi(\mu_3) = \chi(\mu_2)$.

4 Geometric representation theorem for degree-k oriented matroids

In this section, we prove that degree-k oriented matroids can always be represented by the following generalization of configurations formed by points and graphs of polynomial functions of degree k.

Definition 4.1 (k-intersecting pseudoconfiguration of points)
A pair $PP = (P, L)$ of a point configuration $P = (p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ $(x(p_1) < \cdots < x(p_n))$ in the 2-dimensional Euclidean space and a collection L of x-monotone Jordan curves is called a *k-intersecting pseudoconfiguration of points* if the following conditions hold:

(PP1) For any $l \in L$, there exist at least $k+1$ points of P lying on l.

(PP2) For any $k+1$ points of P, there exists a unique curve $l \in L$ passing though each point.

(PP3) For any $l_1, l_2 \in L$ $(l_1 \neq l_2)$, l_1 and l_2 intersect (transversally) at most k times.

Here, a Jordan curve is called *x-monotone* if it intersects with any vertical line at most once. For $l \in L$, we denote $P(l) := P \cap l$. If $|P(l)| = k+1$ for all $l \in L$, then the configuration PP is said to be *simple*. When PP is a simple configuration, we denote the curve determined by points $p_{i_1}, \ldots, p_{i_{k+1}}$ by $l_{i_1,\ldots,i_{k+1}}$. An x-monotone Jordan curve l can be written as $l = \{(x, f(x)) \mid x \in \mathbb{R}\}$, for some continuous function $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$. We define $l^+ := \{(x, y) \mid y > f(x)\}$, $l^- := \{(x, y) \mid y < f(x)\}$, and $\overline{l^+} := l^+ \cup l$, $\overline{l^-} := l^- \cup l$. We call l^+ (resp. l^-) the *$(+1)$-side* (resp. *(-1)-side*) of l. For $Q \subset P$, the *subconfiguration* induced by Q is a k-intersecting pseudoconfiguration $(Q, L|_Q)$, where $L|_Q := \{l \in L \mid P(l) \subset Q\}$.

For each k-intersecting pseudoconfigurations of points, a partition function is defined in a similar manner



Figure 3: A 2-intersecting pseudoconfiguraiton of points

as in the case of configurations formed by points and graphs of polynomial functions of degree k. To define and analyze this, we require the following notion.

Definition 4.2 (Lenses)
Let (P, L) be a k-intersecting pseudoconfiguration of points. A *lens* (or *full lens*) of (P, L) is a region that can be represented as $\overline{l_1^+} \cap \overline{l_2^-} \cap ([x_1, x_2] \times \mathbb{R})$, where $l_1, l_2 \in L$, and x_1 and x_2 are the x-coordinates of consecutive intersection points of l_1 and l_2. Note that $l_1 \cap l_2 \cap ([x_1, x_2] \times \mathbb{R})$ consists of two points. We call these the *end points* of R. The end point with the greater (resp. smaller) x-coordinate is called the right (resp. left) end point, and is denoted by $e_r(R)$ (resp. $e_l(R)$).

A *half lens* of (P, L) is a region represented as $\overline{l_1^+} \cap \overline{l_2^-} \cap ([x_1, \infty) \times \mathbb{R})$ or $\overline{l_1^+} \cap \overline{l_2^-} \cap ((-\infty, x_2] \times \mathbb{R})$, where $l_1, l_2 \in L$, and x_1 and x_2 are the x-coordinates of the leftmost and rightmost intersection points of l_1 and l_2, respectively. We call a full or half lens R an *empty lens* if $P \cap R = \emptyset$.

Given a simple k-intersecting pseudoconfiguration of points $PP = (P, L)$ (or more generally a configuration satisfying only (PP1) and (PP2)), we define a map $\chi_{PP} : [n]^{k+2} \to \{+, -, 0\}$ as follows.

- For $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{k+2} \in [n]$ with $\lambda_1 < \cdots < \lambda_{k+1}$, we have

$$\chi_{PP}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{k+2}) = \begin{cases} +1 & \text{if } p_{\lambda_{k+2}} \in l^+_{\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{k+1}}, \\ -1 & \text{if } p_{\lambda_{k+2}} \in l^-_{\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{k+1}}. \end{cases}$$

- $\chi_{PP}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{k+2}) = 0$ if $\lambda_i = \lambda_j$ for some $i, j \in [k+2]$ $(i \neq j)$.
- $\chi_{PP}(\lambda_{\sigma(1)}, \ldots, \lambda_{\sigma(k+2)}) = \mathrm{sgn}(\sigma)\chi_{PP}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{k+2})$ for any $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{k+2} \in [n]$ and any permutation σ on $[k+2]$.

Proposition 4.3 The map χ_{PP} is well-defined.

Proof. It suffices to show that for any permutation σ on $[k+2]$ with $\sigma(1) < \cdots < \sigma(k+1)$ and any sign $s \in \{+, -\}$, we have $p_{\lambda_{\sigma(k+2)}} \in l^{\mathrm{sgn}(\sigma)\cdot s}_{\lambda_{\sigma(1)}, \ldots, \lambda_{\sigma(k+1)}} \Leftrightarrow p_{\lambda_{k+2}} \in l^s_{\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{k+1}}$. First, we pick such a σ arbitrarily. Then, we have

$$\sigma(i) = \begin{cases} i & \text{if } i \leq i_0, \\ i+1 & \text{if } i_0 + 1 \leq i \leq k+1, \\ i_0 + 1 & \text{if } i = k+2 \end{cases}$$

for some $i_0 \in [k+1]$ and $\mathrm{sgn}(\sigma) = (-1)^{k+1-i_0}$. If $i_0 = k+1$, then the proposition is trivial, and thus we assume that $i_0 \neq k+1$. Then, the curves $l_{\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{k+1}}$ and $l_{\lambda_{\sigma(1)}, \ldots, \lambda_{\sigma(k+1)}}$ intersect at the points $p_{\lambda_1}, \ldots, p_{\lambda_{i_0}}, p_{\lambda_{i_0+2}}, \ldots, p_{\lambda_{k+1}}$. By the condition of k-intersecting pseudoconfigurations of points, these two curves must not intersect elsewhere, and thus the curve $l_{\lambda_{\sigma(1)}, \ldots, \lambda_{\sigma(k+1)}}$ must lie above $l_{\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{k+1}}$

over the interval $(x(p_{\lambda_{k+1}}), \infty)$ if $p_{\lambda_{k+2}}$ is above $l_{\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_{k+1}}$. Because the above-below relationship of $l_{\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_{k+1}}$ and $l_{\lambda_{\sigma(1)},\ldots,\lambda_{\sigma(k+1)}}$ is reversed at each end point of each lens formed by these two curves, the curve $l_{\lambda_{\sigma(1)},\ldots,\lambda_{\sigma(k+1)}}$ must lie above (resp. below) $l_{\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_{k+1}}$ over the interval $(x(p_{\lambda_{i_0-1}}), x(p_{\lambda_{i_0+1}}))$ if $k - i_0$ is even, i.e., if $\mathrm{sgn}(\sigma) = +1$ (resp. if $k - i_0$ is odd, i.e., if $\mathrm{sgn}(\sigma) = -1$). Therefore, we have $p_{\sigma(k+2)} = p_{\lambda_{i_0}} \in l^{\mathrm{sgn}(\sigma)}_{\lambda_{\sigma(1)},\ldots,\lambda_{\sigma(k+1)}}$. The same discussion applies in the case that $p_{\lambda_{k+2}}$ is below $l_{\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_{k+1}}$. ∎



Figure 4: $l_{\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_{k+1}}$ and $l_{\lambda_{\sigma(1)},\ldots,\lambda_{\sigma(k+1)}}$

Step 1: k-intersecting pseudoconfigurations of points determine degree-k oriented matroids

Proposition 4.4 For every simple k-intersecting pseudoconfiguration of points $PP = (P = (p_e)_{e\in[n]}, L)$, the map χ_{PP} defines a degree-k uniform oriented matroid.

Proof. First, we prove that the map χ_{PP} is a chirotope of an oriented matroid of rank $k+2$. For this, it suffices to prove that the set $\mathcal{C}^*_{PP} := \{\pm(\chi_{PP}(\lambda,1),\ldots,\chi_{PP}(\lambda,n)) \mid \lambda \in [n]^{k+1}\} \setminus \{0\}$ fulfills the cocircuit axioms of oriented matroids. Clearly, Axioms (C0)–(C2) are satisfied and we need only verify Axiom (C3). Because we have $|X^0| = k+1$ for all $X \in \mathcal{C}^*_{PP}$, it suffices to verify Axiom (C3'). Take $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda([n], k+1)$ with $|\bar{\lambda} \cap \bar{\mu}| = k$. Let $X, Y \in \mathcal{C}^*_{PP}$ be sign vectors that correspond to l_λ and l_μ, respectively (X and Y are determined uniquely up to a sign reversal). Take an $e \in (X^+ \cap Y^-) \cup (X^- \cap Y^+)$ and any $f_0 \in (X^+ \cap Y^+) \cup (X^- \cap Y^-)$, and let $Z \in \mathcal{C}^*_{PP}$ be the sign vector with $Z(f_0) = X(f_0)$ that corresponds to $l_{\bar{\lambda}\cap\bar{\mu}\cup\{e\}}$. Let us verify that Z is a required cocircuit in (C3'). Note that l_λ and l_μ form $k+1$ lenses (see Figure 5). Because $l_{\bar{\lambda}\cap\bar{\mu}\cup\{e\}}$ already intersects with l_λ and l_μ k times at the points with indices in $\bar{\lambda} \cap \bar{\mu}$, it cannot intersect with l_λ or l_μ elsewhere. Therefore, if p_e is contained inside of one of the lenses, then the whole of $l_{\bar{\lambda}\cap\bar{\mu}\cup\{e\}}$ must lie in the lenses. Take any $f \in [n]$ with $X(f) = Y(f) \neq 0$. Then, p_f lies outside of the lenses formed by l_λ and l_μ, and thus p_f and p_{f_0} lie on the same side of $l_{\bar{\lambda}\cap\bar{\mu}\cup\{e\}}$. If p_e is outside of the lenses, then the whole of $l_{\bar{\lambda}\cap\bar{\mu}\cup\{e\}}$ must lie outside of the lenses (except for the end points). Points p_f with $X(f) = Y(f) \neq 0$ corresponds to points inside of the lenses and a similar discussion shows that $X(f) = Z(f)$. Therefore, we have $Z^+ \supset X^+ \cap Y^+$ and $Z^- \supset X^- \cap Y^-$.



Figure 5: l_λ, l_μ, and $l_{\bar{\lambda}\cap\bar{\mu}\cup\{e\}}$

Next, we confirm the $(k+3)$-locally unimodal property. Suppose that there exist $\lambda \in \Lambda([n], k+3)$ and $\nu_1, \nu_2, \nu_3 \in \Lambda(\bar{\lambda}, k+2)$ such that $\nu_1 < \nu_2 < \nu_3$ and $\chi_{PP}(\nu_1) = \chi_{PP}(\nu_2) = +1$, $\chi_{PP}(\nu_3) = -1$. Let $\mu = \nu_1 \cap \nu_2 \cap \nu_3 \in \Lambda(\bar{\lambda}, k)$ and a, b, c $(a < b < c)$ be the integers such that $\bar{\nu_1} = \bar{\mu} \cup \{a, b\}$, $\bar{\nu_2} = \bar{\mu} \cup \{a, c\}$, and $\bar{\nu_3} = \bar{\mu} \cup \{b, c\}$. Let i_a be the integer such that $\mu_{i_a} < a < \mu_{i_a+1}$, where we assume that $\lambda_0 = -\infty$ and $\lambda_{k+4} = \infty$. Let the integers i_b and i_c be defined similarly. Since $\chi_{PP}(\nu_1) = \chi_{PP}(\nu_3) = +1$, the point p_b is on the $(-1)^{k+1-i_b}$-side of $l_{\mu\cup\{a\}}$ and on the $(-1)^{k+2-i_b}$-side of $l_{\mu\cup\{c\}}$. Because $l_{\mu\cup\{a\}}$ and $l_{\mu\cup\{c\}}$ must not intersect more than k times, the curves $l_{\mu\cup\{a\}}$ and $l_{\mu\cup\{c\}}$ form lenses with end points $p_{\mu_1}, \ldots, p_{\mu_k}$, and $l_{\mu\cup\{b\}}$ must lie inside of these lenses. Now, we remark that the point p_c is on the $(-1)^{k+1-i_c}$-side of $l_{\mu\cup\{a\}}$ and the $(-1)^{k+2-i_c}$-side of $l_{\mu\cup\{b\}}$, because $\chi_{PP}(\nu_2) = -1$ and $\chi_{PP}(\nu_3) = +1$. Therefore, the curve $l_{\mu\cup\{c\}}$ must intersect with either $l_{\mu\cup\{a\}}$ or $l_{\mu\cup\{b\}}$ in $(x(p_{\mu_{i_c}}), x(p_c))$. This means that $l_{\mu\cup\{c\}}$ must intersect with either $l_{\mu\cup\{a\}}$ or $l_{\mu\cup\{b\}}$ at least $k+1$ times, which is a contradiction. ∎



Figure 6: $l_{\mu\cup\{a\}}$, $l_{\mu\cup\{b\}}$, and $l_{\mu\cup\{c\}}$

Step 2: Degree-k oriented matroids can be represented as k-intersecting pseudoconfigurations of points

Here, we prove that every degree-k oriented matroid admits a geometric representation as a k-intersecting pseudoconfiguration of points. To this end, we introduce two operations.

Definition 4.5 (Empty lens elimination I)
Let R be an empty lens represented as $R = \overline{l_1^+} \cap \overline{l_2^-} \cap ([x_1, x_2] \times \mathbb{R})$, where $l_1, l_2 \in L$, and x_1 (resp. x_2) can be $-\infty$ (resp. ∞). Transform l_1 and l_2 by connecting $l_1 \cap (-\infty, x_1 - \epsilon]$, $l_2 \cap [x_1 + \epsilon, x_2 - \epsilon]$, and $l_1 \cap [x_2 + \epsilon, \infty)$ (when $x_1 \neq -\infty$), and by connecting $l_2 \cap (-\infty, x_1 - \epsilon]$, $l_1 \cap [x_1 + \epsilon, x_2 - \epsilon]$, and $l_2 \cap [x_2 + \epsilon, \infty)$ (when $x_2 \neq \infty$), for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, so that the new curves do not touch around the vertical lines $x = x_1$ and $x = x_2$ (see Figure 7).



Figure 7: Empty lens elimination I (empty lenses are shaded)

Definition 4.6 (Empty lens elimination II)
Let $R_1, \ldots, R_n$ be lenses represented as $R_1 = \overline{l_1^+} \cap \overline{l_2^-} \cap ([x_1, x_2] \times \mathbb{R})$ and $R_2 = \overline{l_1^-} \cap \overline{l_2^+} \cap ([x_2, x_3] \times \mathbb{R})$, $\ldots$,

$R_n = \overline{l^-_{n \bmod 2}} \cap \overline{l^+_{n \bmod 2+1}} \cap ([x_n, x_{n+1}] \times \mathbb{R})$ where $l_1, l_2 \in L$, and $x_1 = -\infty$, $x_{n+1} = \infty$. Suppose that $R_i \setminus \{e_r(R_i)\}$, $R_{i+1} \setminus \{e_l(R_{i+1}), e_r(R_{i+1})\}$, $\ldots$, $R_{j-1} \setminus \{e_l(R_{j-1}), e_r(R_{j-1})\}$ and $R_j \setminus \{e_l(R_j)\}$ are empty for some $1 \le i < j \le n$. Transform l_1 and l_2 by connecting $l_1 \cap (-\infty, x_{i+1} - \epsilon]$, $l_2 \cap [x_{i+1} + \epsilon, x_j - \epsilon]$, and $l_1 \cap [x_j + \epsilon, \infty)$, and by connecting $l_2 \cap (-\infty, x_{i+1} - \epsilon]$, $l_1 \cap [x_{i+1} + \epsilon, x_j - \epsilon]$, and $l_2 \cap [x_j + \epsilon, \infty)$, for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, so that the new curves do not touch around the vertical lines $x = x_{i+1}$ and $x = x_j$ (see Figure 8).



Figure 8: Empty lens elimination II (empty lenses are shaded)

The two operations decribed above decrease the total number of intersection points of the curves in L, without altering the above-below relationships between the points in P and the curves in L. However, they may invalidate the condition that each pair of curves in L intersect at most k times. However, we prove that a k-intersecting pseudoconfiguration of points is always obtained after the operations are applied as far as possible.

Lemma 4.7 Let $PP = (P, L)$ be a simple configuration with a finite point set P in $\mathbb{R}^2$ and a collection L of x-monotone Jordan curves satisfying (PP1) and (PP2) in Definition 4.1 (with some pair of curves possibly intersecting more than k times). We assume that the map χ_{PP} fulfills the axioms of degree-k oriented matroids. If it is impossible to apply the empty lens eliminations to PP, then PP is a k-intersecting pseudoconfiguration of points.

Proof. Assume that there is a pair of curves in L that intersect more than k times. Let $\widetilde{P}$ be a minimal subset of P such that there are two curves in $L|_{\widetilde{P}}$ intersecting more than k times after the empty lens eliminations are applied as far as possible. Let l_1 and l_2 be curves in $L|_{\widetilde{P}}$ that have the smallest x-coordinate for the $(k+1)$st intersection point. The curves l_1 and l_2 form $k_0 \ge k$ full lenses and two half lenses. Let us label these $k_0 + 2$ full and half lenses by $R_1, \ldots, R_{k_0+2}$ in increasing order for the x-coordinates. Because the empty lens eliminations I and II cannot be applied, there must exist $k_0 + 2$ distinct points $p_{i_1}, \ldots, p_{i_{k_0+2}}$ with $p_{i_1} \in R_1, \ldots, p_{i_{k_0+2}} \in R_{k_0+2}$. Note that there are no points outside of the lenses $R_1 \cup \cdots \cup R_{i_{k_0+2}}$, by the minimality of $\widetilde{P}$. Let $I_{k+1} := (i_1, \ldots, i_{k+1})$ and $I_{k+2} := (i_1, \ldots, i_{k+2})$. We now consider several possible cases separately.

(Case I) $l_{I_{k+1}} \neq l_1, l_2$.

The curve $l_{I_{k+1}}$ must intersect with l_1 and l_2 at least twice in total in each of the full lenses $R_2, \ldots, R_{k+1}$ (to enter and to leave, where passing through an end point is counted twice) and at least once in each of the half or full lenses R_1 and R_{k+2}. If $l_{I_{k+1}}$ intersects with l_1 and l_2 more than twice in total in some lens R_a ($a \le k+1$), this means that they intersect at least four times in R_a, and that either of the $(k+1)$st intersection point of l_1 and $l_{I_{k+1}}$ or that of l_2 and $l_{I_{k+1}}$ belongs to the halfspace $x < x(e_r(R_{k+1}))$. This contradicts the minimality assumption for the x-coordinate of the $(k+1)$st intersection point of l_1 and

l_2. Therefore, the curve $l_{I_{k+1}}$ actually intersects with l_1 and l_2 exactly twice in total in each full lens and once or twice in each half lens. If $p_{i_1} \in R_1 \setminus \{e_r(R_1)\}$, then the curve l_{I_k} intersects with l_1 and l_2 a total of $2k+1$ or $2k+2$ times in the halfspace $x \leq x(e_r(R_k))$, and thus $k+1$ times with l_1 or l_2. Without loss of generality, we assume that $l_{I_{k+1}}$ and l_1 intersect $k+1$ times in the halfspace $x \leq x(e_r(R_{k+1}))$. Because of the minimality assumption, the $(k+1)$st intersection point of $l_{I_{k+1}}$ and l_1 must coincide with $e_r(R_{k+1})$. Let $R'_1, \ldots, R'_{k+2}$ be the lenses formed by l_1 and $l_{I_{k+1}}$ (ordered by the x-coordinates). We have $p_{i_1} \in l_{I_{k+1}} \cap R'_1$, $\ldots$, $p_{i_{k+1}} (= e_r(R'_{k+1})) \in l_{I_{k+1}} \cap R'_{k+1}$. On the other hand, if $p_{i_1} = e_r(R_1)$, then it must hold that $p_{i_{k+1}} \in R_{k+2} \setminus \{e_r(R_{k+1})\}$. This mirrors the case with $p_{i_1} \in R_1 \setminus \{e_r(R_1)\}$ and the remainder of the discussion proceeds in the same manner. Therefore, we consider only the case with $p_{i_1} \in R_1 \setminus \{e_r(R_1)\}$ in what follows. We can classify the possible situations into the following two cases.



Figure 9: l_1, l_2, and $l_{I_{k+1}}$

(Case I-i) $(\widetilde{P} \setminus \widetilde{P}(l_{I_{k+1}})) \cap \bigcup_{i=1}^{k+1} (R'_i \setminus \{e_l(R'_i), e_r(R'_i)\}) \neq \emptyset$.

Let $j := \min\{u \in [n] \mid p_u \in (\widetilde{P} \setminus \widetilde{P}(l_{I_{k+1}})) \cap \bigcup_{i=1}^{k+1} (R'_i \setminus \{e_l(R'_i), e_r(R'_i)\})\}$, and let $j^* \in [k+1]$ be such that $p_j \in R'_{j^*} \setminus \{e_l(R'_{j^*}), e_r(R'_{j^*})\}$. The curves $l_{I_{k+1}[i_{j^*}|j]}$ and $l_{I_{k+1}}$ intersect $k+1$ times in the halfspace $x \leq x(e_r(R'_{k+1}))$ (cf. Figures 10 and 11). Let $R^*_1, \ldots, R^*_{k+2}$ be the $k+2$ leftmost lenses formed by $l_{I_{k+1}[i_{j^*}|j]}$ and $l_{I_{k+1}}$, which are labeled in increasing order of the x-coordinates. Then, we have $p_{i_1} = e_r(R^*_1), \ldots, p_{i_{j^*-1}} = e_r(R^*_{j^*-1})$, $p_{i_{j^*+1}} = e_r(R^*_{j^*+1}), \ldots, p_{i_{k+1}} = e_r(R^*_{k+1})$, and $p_j, p_{i_{j^*}} \in R^*_{j^*} \cup R^*_{j^*+1}$.

Assume that $p_j \in R^*_{j^*}$ and $p_{i_{j^*}} \in R^*_{j^*+1}$. Then, by the above-below relationship of $l_{I_{k+1}[i_{j^*}|j]}$ and $l_{I_{k+1}}$, it must hold that if p_j is on the σ-side ($\sigma \in \{+1, -1\}$) of l_{k+1}, then $p_{i_{j^*}}$ must lie on the σ-side of $l_{I_{k+1}[i_{j^*}|j]}$ (cf. Figures 10 and 11). This implies that $\chi_{PP}(I_{k+1}, j) = \chi_{PP}(I_{k+1}[i_{j^*}|j], i_{j^*})$, which contradicts the chirotope axioms. A similar discussion also leads to a contradiction if $p_j \in R^*_{j^*+1}$ and $p_{i_{j^*}} \in R^*_{j^*}$. Therefore, we have $p_j, p_{i_{j^*}} \in R^*_{j^*}$ or $p_j, p_{i_{j^*}} \in R^*_{j^*+1}$.

First, we consider the case that $p_j, p_{i_{j^*}} \in R^*_{j^*}$. Let us assume that $i_{j^*} < j$. Remark that there must exist a point $p_a \in \widetilde{P} \cap (R^*_{a^*} \setminus \partial R^*_{a^*})$ for some $a^* \in [j^*+1, k+2]$ because otherwise empty lens elimination II can be applied to $R^*_{j^*+1}, \ldots, R^*_{k+2}$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\chi_{PP}(I_{k+1}, a) = +1$ and $\chi_{PP}(I_{k+1}[i_{j^*}|j], a) = -1$. Then, we have $\chi_{PP}(I_{k+1}[j, a] \setminus \{j\}) = (-1)^{k-a^*}$ and $\chi_{PP}(I_{k+1}[j, a] \setminus \{i_{j^*}\}) = (-1)^{k-a^*+1}$, where $I_{k+1}[j, a] := (i_1, \ldots, i_{j^*}, j, i_{j^*+1}, \ldots, i_{a^*-1}, a, i_{a^*}, \ldots, i_{k+1})$. By the $(k+3)$-locally unimodal property, we have $\chi_{PP}(I_{k+1}[j, a] \setminus \{a\}) = (-1)^{k-a^*}$, and thus $\chi_{PP}(I_{k+1}, j) = (-1)^{j^*-a^*+1}$. This means that the point p_j is on the $(-1)^{j^*-a^*+1}$-side of $l_{I_{k+1}}$, and thus that $l_{I_{k+1}[i_{j^*}|j]}$ is on the $(-1)^{j^*-a^*+1}$-side of $l_{I_{k+1}}$ at $x = x(p_j)$. On the other hand, by the assumption $\chi_{PP}(I_{k+1}, a) = +1$ and $\chi_{PP}(I_{k+1}[i_{j^*}|j], a) = -1$, the curve $l_{I_{k+1}[i_{j^*}|j]}$ must be above $l_{I_{k+1}}$ at $x = x(p_a)$. Because the above-below relationship of $l_{I_{k+1}[i_{j^*}|j]}$ and $l_{I_{k+1}}$ is reversed at each end point of each lens, the curve $l_{I_{k+1}[i_{j^*}|j]}$ must lie on the $(-1)^{a^*-j^*}$-side of $l_{I_{k+1}}$ at $x = x(p_j)$. This is a contradiction. We also obtain a contradiction in the case that $i_{j^*} > j$. The case that $p_j, p_{i_{j^*}} \in R^*_{j^*+1}$ can be treated similarly.



Figure 10: l_1, $l_{I_{k+1}}$, and $l_{I_{k+1}[i_{j^*}|j]}$ $(p_j, p_{i_{j^*}} \in R^*_{j^*},\ p_j \in \widetilde{P}(l_1))$



Figure 11: l_1, $l_{I_{k+1}}$, and $l_{I_{k+1}[i_{j^*}|j]}$ $(p_j, p_{i_{j^*}} \in R^*_{j^*+1},\ p_j \in \widetilde{P}(l_1))$

(Case I-ii) $(\widetilde{P} \setminus \widetilde{P}(l_{I_{k+1}})) \cap \bigcup_{i=1}^{k+1} (R'_i \setminus \{e_l(R'_i), e_r(R'_i)\}) = \emptyset$.

Let $p_{j_1}, \ldots, p_{j_{k+1}}$ be the points of $\widetilde{P}(l_1)$ ordered in increasing order of the x-coordinates. Then, for some $b \in [k]$ it holds that $p_{j_1}, \ldots, p_{j_b} (= p_{i_{k+1}}) \in \{e_r(R'_1), \ldots, e_r(R'_{k+1})\}$ and $p_{j_{b+1}}, \ldots, p_{j_{k+1}} \in R'_{k+2} \setminus \{e_l(R'_{k+2})\}$.

First, we assume that $b < k$ and derive a contradiction. Take $p_{i_c} \in \widetilde{P}(l_{I_{k+1}}) \setminus \widetilde{P}(l_1)$, and note that $p_{i_c} \in R'_c \setminus \{e_l(R'_c), e_r(R'_c)\}$. Then, the curve $l_{I_{k+1}[i_c|j_{b+1}]}$ intersects with l_1 and l_{k+1} twice in total in each of the lenses $R'_2 \setminus \{e_l(R'_2)\}, \ldots, R'_{c-1} \setminus \{e_l(R'_{c-1})\}$, $R'_{c+1} \setminus \{e_l(R'_{c+1})\}, \ldots, R'_{k+1} \setminus \{e_l(R'_{k+1})\}$, and once or twice in R'_1 (see Figure 12). Now, we remark that $l_{I_{k+1}[i_c|j_{b+1}]}$ does not intersect twice with l_1 or $l_{I_{k+1}}$ inside each of the lenses listed above because otherwise an empty lens is formed. Therefore, $l_{I_{k+1}[i_c|j_{b+1}]}$ intersects exactly once with l_1 and $l_{I_{k+1}}$ in each of the full lenses listed above. Let us consider the case that $c \neq 1$. If $l_{I_{k+1}[i_c|j_{b+1}]}$ intersects a total of two times with l_1 and $l_{I_{k+1}}$ in $R'_1 \setminus \{e_r(R'_1)\}$, then it intersects a total of more than $2k$ times with l_1 and $l_{I_{k+1}}$, and thus more than k times with l_1 or $l_{I_{k+1}}$. Since $\widetilde{P}(l_{I_{k+1}[i_c|j_{b+1}]}) \cup \widetilde{P}(l_1) \subset \widetilde{P} \setminus \{p_{i_c}\}$ and $\widetilde{P}(l_{I_{k+1}[i_c|j_{b+1}]}) \cup \widetilde{P}(l_{I_{k+1}}) \subset \widetilde{P} \setminus \{p_{j_{b+2}}\}$, this is a contradiction. If $l_{I_{k+1}[i_c|j_{b+1}]}$ intersects just once in total with l_1 and $l_{I_{k+1}}$ in $R'_1 \setminus \{e_r(R'_1)\}$, then $l_{I_{k+1}}$ lies between l_1 and $l_{I_{k+1}[i_c|j_{b+1}]}$ around the vertical line $x = x(e_r(R'_1))$, and the situations are the same for all of the end points of the lenses $R'_1, \ldots, R'_{k+1}$. This leads to the conclusion that $l_{I_{k+1}[i_c|j_{b+1}]}$ intersects with both l_1 and $l_{I_{k+1}}$ in $(x(e_r(R'_{k+1})), x(p_{j_{b+1}})) \times \mathbb{R}$, and thus that $l_{I_{k+1}[i_c|j_{b+1}]}$ intersects more than k times with l_1 or $l_{I_{k+1}}$. This contradicts the minimality assumption of $\widetilde{P}$. We also obtain a contradiction in the case that $c = 1$.

Finally, we see that a contradiction also occurs in the case that $b = k$. Let $p_{i_c} \in \widetilde{P}(l_{I_{k+1}}) \setminus \widetilde{P}(l_1)$. Assume that l_1 and $l_{I_{k+1}}$ intersect in $(x(e_r(R'_{k+1})), x(p_{j_{k+1}})) \times \mathbb{R}$, and form a full lens R'_{k+2}. Then, we can apply empty lens elimination II to R'_{k+1} and R'_{k+2}, which is a contradiction. Therefore, the curves l_1 and $l_{I_{k+1}}$ do not intersect in $(x(e_r(R'_{k+1})), x(p_{j_{k+1}})) \times \mathbb{R}$. Without loss of generality, we assume that l_1 is above $l_{I_{k+1}}$ at $x = x(p_{j_{k+1}})$, i.e., $\chi(I_{k+1}, j_{k+1}) = +1$. Then, by considering the above-below relationship of l_1 and $l_{I_{k+1}}$ in each lens, we see that the point p_{i_c} is on the $(-1)^{k+2-c}$-side of l_1, i.e., $\chi(I_{k+1} \setminus \{i_c\}, j_{k+1}, i_c) = (-1)^{k+2-c}$. This contradicts the chirotope axioms.

(Case II) $l_{I_{k+1}} = l_1$ or $l_{I_{k+1}} = l_2$.

We can apply the same discussion as above, by considering l_1 and l_2 instead of l_1 and $l_{I_{k+1}}$. ∎

Theorem 4.8 Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a degree-k uniform oriented matroid on the ground set $[n]$. Then, there exists



Figure 12: l_1, $l_{I_{k+1}}$, and $l_{I_{k+1}[i_c|j_{b+1}]}$

a k-intersecting pseudoconfiguration of points $PP = ((p_e)_{e\in[n]}, L)$ such that $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_{PP}$.

Proof. Let $P = ((1,0),(2,0),\ldots,(n,0))$. For each $(i_1,\ldots,i_{k+1}) \in \Lambda([n],k+1)$, we construct $l_{i_1,\ldots,i_{k+1}}$ so that p_j lies above (resp. below) it if $\chi(i_1,\ldots,i_{k+1},j) = +1$ (resp. -1) and $p_{i_1},\ldots,p_{i_{k+1}}$ lie on $l_{i_1,\ldots,i_{k+1}}$, and any three curves intersect at the same point $p \notin P$. Then, apply empty lens eliminations I and II as far as possible. ∎

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we have introduced a new class of oriented matroids, called degree-k oriented matroids, which abstracts the combinatorial behavior of partitions of point configurations in the 2-dimensional Euclidean space by graphs of polynomial functions of degree k. As a first step, we proved that there exits a natural class of geometric objects, called k-intersecting pseudoconfigurations of points, that corresponds to degree-k oriented matroids. This provides evidence that the defintion of degree-k oriented matroids is natural one. From another point of view, degree-k oriented matroids provide a class of oriented matroids of rank $k+2$ that can be represented by 2-dimensional geometric objects. It would be interesting in future work to verify open conjectures, such as the Las Vergnas simplicial conjecture [10], which are known to be true for rank 3 oriented matroids [11] but not for those of higher rank.

Acknowledgement

The author is grateful to Yuya Hodokuma for the opportunity to read the paper [6] together, which motivated the author to introduce degree-k oriented matroids. This research is partially supported by JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists (B) 26730002.

References

[1] F. Ardila and M. Develin. Tropical hyperplane arrangements and oriented matroids, Mathematische Zeitschrift, Volume 262, Issue 4, pp.795–816, 2009.

[2] A. Björner, M. Las Vergnas, B. Sturmfels, N. White and G.M. Ziegler. Oriented Matroids (2nd edition), Cambridge University Press, 1999.

[3] R.G. Bland and M. Las Vergnas. Orientability of matroids, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B, Volume 24, Issue 1, pp. 94–123, 1978.

[4] J. Bokowski, S. Mock and I. Streinu. On the Folkman-Lawrence Topological Representation Theorem for Oriented Matroids of Rank 3, European Journal of Combinatorics, Volume 22, Issue 5, pp. 601–615, 2001.

[5] J. Bokowski, S. King, S. Mock and I. Streinu. The Topological Representation of Oriented Matroids, Discrete and Computational Geometry, Volume 33, Issue 4, pp. 645–668, 2005.

[6] M. Eliáš and J. Matoušek. Higher-order Erdős-Szekeres theorems, Advances in Mathematics, Volume 244, Issue 10, pp. 1–15, 2013.

[7] J. Folkman and J. Lawrence. Oriented matroids, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Ser. B 25, pp. 199–236, 1978.

[8] J.E. Goodman and R. Pollack. Semispaces of configurations, cell complexes of arrangements, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A, Volume 37, Issue 3, pp. 257–293, 1984.

[9] S. Horn. Topological Representation Theorem for Tropical Oriented Matroids, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A, Volume 142, pp. 77–112, 2016.

[10] M. Las Vergnas. Convexity in oriented matroids, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B, Volume 29, pp. 231–234, 1980.

[11] F. Levi. Die Teilung der projektiven Ebene durch Geradeoder Pseudogerade, Ber. Math-Phys. Kl. Sächs. Akad. Wiss., 78. 256–267, 1926.

[12] H. Miyata. A 2-dimensional topological representation theorem for rank 4 matroid polytopes, IEICE technical report, Volume 116, Issue 211, pp. 45–52, 2016.

[13] F. Santos. On delaunay oriented matroids for convex distance functions, Discrete and Computational Geometry, Volume 16, Issue 2, pp.197–210, 1996.